UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/706,408	11/12/2003	Sherif Yacoub	200300593-1	6791
22879 HEWLETT PA	7590 02/27/2008 ACKARD COMPANY	EXAMINER		
P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400			JONES, DANELLE E	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	-, ·		2626	
		•		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
	•		02/27/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

JERRY.SHORMA@HP.COM mkraft@hp.com ipa.mail@hp.com

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/706,408	YACOUB, SHERIF				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
•	Danelle E. Jones	2626				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app						
Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tirr vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from 1. cause the application to become AB ANDONE	N. sely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status		•				
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10/19						
,						
	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-30</u> is/are pending in the application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6) Claim(s) is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	r election requirement.	•				
oj Claim(s) ure subject to rectiletion unare	, () ()					
Application Papers						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine						
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
11) The bath of declaration is objected to by the Ex	Common Hoto the attached Cines					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a))-(d) or (f).				
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage						
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
Occ the attached detailed office detail for a fiet of the detailed depict fiet reserved.						
		•				
Attachment(s)	4) 🔲 Interview Summary	(PTO-413)				
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 	Paper No(s)/Mail D	ate				
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	5) Notice of Informal I 6) Other:	ratent Application				

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

- 1. Applicant's arguments filed 10/19/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. With respect claims 1, 6, and 23, Zuberec et al. discloses detecting an utterance, where the utterance is the path, and detecting it is the act of retrieving it. Additionally, retrieving a set of options from an identified path is discloses, where the decision is made based on a set of options that are present. Finally concatenating the paths is demonstrated by the ballooned grammar. Where the ballooned grammar is expanded based on the users utterance.
- 2. Applicant's arguments filed 10/19/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. With respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 7 and 14 Zuberec et al., Figure 7, illustrates a process of determining a correct path by a decision tree. Also the message is found during this decision when the detection of the utterance takes place.
- 3. Applicant's arguments filed 10/19/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. With respect to the rejection of claim 18, Zuberec et al., col. 10, lines 56-63, discloses there are changing grammars, thus the system does not describe all available paths, only the path pertaining to that particular grammar.
- 4. Applicant's arguments filed 10/19/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. With respect to claims 3 and 25, Zuberec et al. discloses the limitations of claims 1 and 23. Although Catallo is directed towards assigning context in normal human interaction, it is capable of loading words based on context.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 6. Claims 1-2, 4-24, 26-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Zuberec et al. US 6,298,324.

Regarding **claims 1 and 6**, Zuberec et al. discloses a processor-based method for producing a message during a speech recognition application (see col. 3, lines 49-51) comprising:

retrieving an identified path from a set of paths (see col. 9, lines 32-35);

retrieving an identified option from a set of options associated with the identified path (see col. 9, lines 57-64);

concatenating the identified path and the identified option to form a selection path (see col. 9, lines 64-67);

and producing a message associated with the selection path (see col. 9, lines 42-45).

Regarding **claim 2**, Zuberec et al. discloses the processor-based method of claim 1 wherein said identified path is retrieved without executing a general assistance command for describing to a user all available paths (see col. 9, lines 58-67).

Regarding **claim 4,** Zuberec et al. discloses the processor-based method of claim 1 additionally comprising continually monitoring the identified path to insure that the identified option is associated with the identified path (see col. 9, lines 60-67, where the identified path is monitored as the additional utterances are added to the ballooned grammar.

Regarding **claim 5**, Zuberec et al. discloses a message produced in accordance with the method of claim 1 (see col. 9, lines 42-45).

Regarding **claims 7 and 14**, Zuberec et al. discloses a speech recognition system comprising:

an application (see fig. 3, element 42, lines 46-47);

an assistance manager for forming a selection path (see fig. 7);

a vocabulary accessible by the application and the assistance manager and including a set of utterances applicable to the application (see fig. 3, element 44, col. 4, line 47); and a speech recognition engine to recognize the utterances (see fig. 3, element 48, col. 4, lines 48).

Regarding **claims 8 and 15,** Zuberec et al. discloses the speech recognition system of claim 7 additionally comprising a converter (see fig. 3, element 49, col. 4, line 49).

10/706,408 Art Unit: 2626

Regarding **claim 9**, Zuberec et al. discloses the speech recognition system of claim 7 wherein said vocabulary additionally includes at least one hot key word (see col. 10, lines 56-63).

Regarding **claims 10 and 16,** Zuberec et al. discloses the speech recognition system of claim 7 additionally comprising a dialog manager (see fig. 7 and col. 8, lines 49-53, where fig. 7, controls the interaction with the system, hence managing the dialog).

Regarding **claims 11 and 17,** Zuberec et al. discloses the speech recognition system of claim 8 additionally comprising a dialog manager (see fig. 7 and col. 8, lines 49-53, where fig. 7, controls the interaction with the system, hence managing the dialog).

Regarding **claim 12**, Zuberec et al. discloses an operating system incorporating the speech recognition system of claim 7 (see col. 4, lines 37-40).

Regarding **claim 13**, Zuberec et al. discloses a computing device incorporating the speech recognition system of claim 7 (see col. 4, lines 37-40).

10/706,408 Art Unit: 2626

Regarding claim 18, Zuberec et al. discloses a processor-based method for providing assistance in a speech recognition application, comprising: creating a speech dialog for enabling a conversation to be conducted in a speech recognition application between a user and a speech recognition system (see col. 9, lines 19-26); providing support for an interrupt event during a conversation between a user and a speech recognition system (see col. 9, lines 49-50); creating a selection path (see col. 9, lines 60-67); creating a message for the selection path (see col. 9, lines 42-45); and interrupting a conversation between a user and a speech recognition system for

Regarding **claim 19,** Zuberec et al. discloses the processor-based method of claim 18 wherein said interrupt event comprises a hot key word (see col. 9, lines 19-26).

providing assistance to the user (see col. 9, lines 49-50).

Regarding **claim 20**, Zuberec et al. discloses the processor-based method of claim 18 wherein said interrupting the conversation comprises interrupting the conversation with the interrupt event (see col. 9, lines 49-50).

Regarding **claim 21,** Zuberec et al. discloses the processor-based method of claim 19 wherein said interrupting the conversation comprises uttering the hot key word by the user (see col. 9, lines 19-26).

Regarding **claim 22**, Zuberec et al. discloses the processor-based method of claim 18 wherein said interrupting a conversation comprises activating an assistance manager (see col. 9, lines 49-54).

Regarding **claim 23**, Zuberec et al. discloses the processor-based method of claim 18 additionally comprising:

retrieving an identified path from a set of paths (see col. 9, lines 32-35);

retrieving an identified option from a set of options associated with the identified path (see col. 9, lines 57-64);

concatenating the identified path and the identified option to form a selection path (see col. 9, lines 64-67);

and producing a message associated with the selection path (see col. 9, lines 42-45).

Regarding **claim 24,** Zuberec et al. discloses the processor-based method of claim 23 wherein said identified path is retrieved without executing a general assistance command for describing to the user all available paths (see col. 9, lines 58-67).

Regarding **claim 26**, Zuberec et al. discloses the processor-based method of claim 18 wherein said interrupting a conversation comprises activating an assistance manager for finding the selection path and for producing the message for the selection path (see col. 9, lines 49-50).

Regarding **claim 27**, Zuberec et al. discloses the processor-based method of claim 19 wherein said interrupting the conversation comprises uttering by the user the hot key word along with a user-selective topic (see col. 9, lines 49-56)

Regarding **claim 28**, Zuberec et al. discloses the processor-based method of claim 27 wherein said user-selective topic is selected from a group of topics consisting of an active path and an option (see col. 9. lines 49-56).

Regarding **claim 29**, Zuberec et al. discloses the processor-based method of claim 28 wherein said selection path comprises said user-selective topic (see col. 9, lines 49-56).

Regarding **claim 30**, Zuberec et al. discloses the processor-based method of claim 28 wherein said selection path comprises said active path (see col. 9, lines 49-56).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

10/706,408 Art Unit: 2626

2. Claims 3 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zuberec et al. US 6,298,324 in view of Catallo et al. US 5,867817.

Regarding claim 3, Zuberec et al. discloses the processor-based method of claim 1. Zuberec does not disclose wherein said identified path is retrieved without having described to a user any paths from the set of paths other than the identified path. However this feature is well known in the art as indicated by Catallo et al. Catallo et al. discloses a speech recognition manager that loads a list of words depending upon the context state (see col. 2, lines 29-31). Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make available certain words to increase speed and accuracy of the system.

Regarding claim 25, Zuberec et al. discloses the processor-based method of claim 23. Zuberec does not disclose wherein said identified path is retrieved without having described to a user any paths from the set of paths other than the identified path. However this feature is well known in the art as indicated by Catallo et al. Catallo et al. discloses a speech recognition manager that loads a list of words depending upon the context state (see col. 2, lines 29-31). Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make available certain words to increase speed and accuracy of the system.

10/706,408 Art Unit: 2626

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Danelle E. Jones whose telephone number is 571-270-1241. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30am - 5:00pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richemond Dorvil can be reached on 571-272-7602. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

DJ 01/30/2008

AICHEMOND DORVIL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER